cg/

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,596	12/28/2000	Jack Lawrence Lerner	SCHW-510	6737

7590	02/22/2005

STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP
ATTN BRIAN J KEATING
121 SPEAR STREET SUITE 290
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

EXAMINER
EL CHANTI, HUSSEIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 October 2004</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-44</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>23-37</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22 and 38-44</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 October 2004</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/04</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to amendment Oct. 5, 2004. Claims 1, 2 and 4 were

amended. Claims 23-37 were canceled. Claims 38-44 were newly added.

Drawings

2.   The drawings were received on Oct. 5, 2004. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-3, 5-21 and 38-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Hoang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,499,052 (referred to hereafter as Hoang).

Hoang teaches the invention explicitly as claimed including a system and method

of removing a merchant cookie and saving the cookie on a middle server (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Hoang teaches a method of providing a single sign-on distributed

application services integration, comprising the steps of:

Providing a central domain server, wherein a configuration file resides on the

central domain server and the configuration file contains a list of cookie fields that may

be read, or written to and identifies whether a particular application has read access or

write access to a field of a cookie of a cookie file (see col. 6 lines 47-65, RMIS receives

a request from the user and determines an associated cookie with the identified user);

receiving a first indication of a user pointing a browser to a first application (see

col. 6 lines 47-65);

receiving a cookie file of said browser corresponding to the user (see col. 9 lines

43-57, a corresponding cookie to the user request is determined in response to a user

request);

updating said cookie file (see col. 10 lines 27-36, the cookie is updated);

receiving a second indication of said user pointing said browser to a second

application (see col. 3 lines 35-45); and

providing the second application with read access to different fields of the

updated cookie file as determined by the list of cookie file which identifies which cookie

fields the second application has read access to and providing the second application

with write access to different fields of the cookie file as determined by the list of cookie

fields (see col. 9 lines 43-57, multiple clients can send multiple requests where each

request has an associated cookie file).

As to claim 2, Hoang teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said cookie file of

said server domain received a said receiving step is encrypted (see col. 1 lines 60-col. 2

lines 5).

As to claim 3, Hoang teaches the method of claim 2 further including the step of decrypting said encrypted cookie file (see col. 1 lines 60-col. 2 lines 5).

As to claim 5, Hoang teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said first and second applications each includes one or more predetermined resources (see col. 9 lines 43-57).

As to claim 6, Hoang teaches the method of claim 5 wherein said predetermined resources include one or more of a web page, a CGI script and a java servlet (see col. 8 lines 56-67).

As to claim 7, Hoang teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said first and second applications reside in a central server domain (see col. 9 lines 43-57).

As to claim 8, Hoang teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said first and second applications are third party applications residing in a central server domain (see col. 9 lines 43-57).

As to claim 9, Hoang teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said step of updating said cookie file includes the steps of:

comparing the cookie file to one or more of predetermined parameters; and

generating said updated cookie file based on said comparing step (see col. 9 lines 43-57).

As to claim 10, Hoang teaches the method of claim 9 wherein said step of comparing includes the step of reading said cookie file and retrieving a corresponding name=value pair for said user (see col. 9 lines 43-57).

As to claim 11, Hoang teaches the method of claim 9 wherein said predetermined parameters include a user identification information, a user event access history information, and a user access level information (see col. 9 lines 43-57).

As to claim 12, Hoang teaches the method of claim 11 wherein said user identification information includes one or more of a user name, a user social security number, a user address, a user telephone number, a user email address, a user age, a user gender, a user account type, and a user account activity history (see col. 3 lines 29-40).

As to claim 13, Hoang teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said step of providing said updated cookie file is performed synchronously with the step of receiving said second indication (see col. 3 lines 29-40).

As to claim 14, Hoang teaches the method of claim 1 wherein when second indication of said user pointing said browser to a second application is received, the updated cookie file is automatically provided to said second application (see col. 10 lines 27-36).

As to claim 15, Hoang teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said first application resides in a central server, and further, wherein said second application is linked by a hypertext link to a remote site (see col. 8 lines 57-67).

As to claim 16, Hoang teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said step of receiving said first indication includes the steps of: receiving a user login information; and comparing said user login information to a predetermined login data (see col. 1 lines 60-col. 2 lines 5).

As to claim 17, Hoang teaches the method of claim 16 wherein said user login information includes a user name and a password (see col. 1 lines 60-col. 2 lines 5).

As to claim 18, Hoang teaches the method of claim 16 wherein said predetermined login data includes a user registration information (see col. 1 lines 60-col. 2 lines 5).

As to claim 19, Hoang teaches the method of claim 16 further including the step of permitting user browser access to said first application based on the outcome of the comparing step (see col. 1 lines 60-col. 2 lines 5).

As to claim 20, Hoang teaches the method of claim 19 wherein said user browser is permitted access said first application when said comparing step returns a match flag (see col. 9 lines 43-60).

As to claim 21, Hoang teaches the method of claim 19 wherein said user browser is not permitted access to said first application when said comparing step returns a fail flag (see col. 9 lines 43-60).

As to claim 38, Hoang teaches a method of providing a distributed application

services integration system comprising:

providing a central domain server, wherein a configuration file resides on the

central domain server, and the configuration file contains a list of cookie fields that may

be read, or written to, and identifies whether a particular application has read access or

write access, to a field of a cookie file (see col. 6 lines 47-65);

providing a first application which transmits first application user event data to a

first application interface library (see col. 9 lines 35-67);

wherein the first application interface library determines whether the first

application user event data is a first type of event data which requires a change to a

field in a cookie file to provide real time communication to other applications of the

system, and the first application determines whether the user event data is a second

type of user event data which does not require real time communication to other

applications of the system (see col. 9 lines 35-67);

using a cookie access library to update a change in a field in the cookie file

where the first application user event data is determined to be a first type of user event

data; where a first application user event data is determined to be a second type of user

event data transmitting the user event data through message queuing middleware (see

col. 9 lines 35-67); and

controlling the first applications access to cookie fields of the cookie file based on

the list in the configuration file (see col. 9 lines 35-67).

As to claim 39, Hoang teaches the method of claim 38 further including: providing a second application which transmits a second application user event data to a second application interface library; wherein the second application interface library determines whether the second application user event data is a first type of event data which requires a change to a field in the cookie file provide real time communication to other applications of the system, and the second application determines whether the second application user event data is a second type of user event data which does not require real time communication to other applications of the system (see col. 9 lines 35-67);

using a cookie access library to update a change a field in the cookie file where the second application user event data is determined to be the first type of user event data; where a second application user event data is determined to be the second type of user event data transmitting the second application user event data through message queuing middleware (see col. 9 lines 35-67); and

controlling the second applications access to cookie fields of the cookie. file based on the list in the configuration file (see col. 9 lines 35-67).

As to claim 40, Hoang teaches the method of claim 38 further including: encrypting first application user event data where the first application user event data is determined to be the second type of event data, prior to transmitting the first application user event data through the message queuing middleware (see col. 9 lines 43-60).

As to claim 41, Hoang teaches the method of claim 38 further including: pushing information from the configuration file through the message delivering middleware to the first application interface library (see col. 9 lines 35-67).

As to claim 42, Hoang teaches the method of claim 41, wherein the information from the configuration file controls the operation of the first application interface library when a user event takes place (see col. 9 lines 35-67).

As to claim 43, Hoang teaches the method of claim 39 further including: pushing information from the configuration file through the message delivering middleware to the first application interface library and the second application interface library (see col. 9 lines 35-67).

As to claim 44, Hoang teaches the method of claim 43, wherein the information pushed from the configuration file controls the operation of the first application interface library when a user event takes place, and controls the operation of the second application interface library (see col. 9 lines 35-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoang in view of Shi.

Hoang teaches a method of providing a single sign-on distributed application services integration, comprising the steps of receiving a first indication of a user pointing

a browser to a first application where the cookie can be a small piece of information

(see col. 1 lines 50-60).

Official Notice is taken that it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hoang to incorporate the 4 Kbytes

cookies because doing so would result in faster access to website since the size of the

file is relatively small and therefore requiring less time to retrieve the cookie file.

5.   Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoang

in view of Shi.

Hoang does not explicitly teach the limitation prompting the user to reenter login

information". However Shi teaches a method of sending a user name and password to

login to a site where the user name and password are sent as a cookie (see col. 8-col.

9).

It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to modify Hoang by prompting said user to reenter the user login information

as taught by Shi because doing so would allow the user to try login process in case an

error occurred during login process.

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered

but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hussein A El-chanti whose telephone number is

(571)272-3999. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571)272-4001. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hussein Elchanti
Feb. 9, 2005

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100